



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,440	12/31/2003	Gregory Joseph Badros	16113-1101001 / GP-167-00	8962
26192	7590	07/11/2008		
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2161				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/749,440

Applicant(s)

BADROS ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P. LeRoux

Art Unit

2161

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-11, 14-32, 35-39, 42-58 and 62-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-11, 14-32, 35-39, 42-58 and 62-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/15/2008 has been entered.

Claim Status

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-32, 35-39, 42-58 and 62-70 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 55-58 and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 55-58 and 64-66 are rejected because computer readable storage medium is included. Paragraph 19 of the specification states that optical media or magnetic media are embodiments of computer readable media. Optical media and magnetic media include electromagnetic signals which are a form of energy. Energy does not fall into one of the statutory classes of invention, i.e., process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 70 recites “wherein the first and second servers collectively comprise a single server.” The claimed “second servers” and the claimed “collectively” are not in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-17, 19, 25, 28-32, 35-39, 42-45, 51, 54-58, 62-67 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommerer et al (Pub No US 2004/0205514), hereafter Sommerer in view of Heilbron et al (Pat No US 7,155,489), hereafter Heilbron.

Regarding claim 1, 17, 29, 55, 57, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, Sommerer discloses displaying, to a user, a first web document received from a first server, the first web document further comprising a search engine result set [paragraph 6, web search results page having links] Sommerer discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose receiving in a client application an interest signal generated in response to a user action, the interest signal indicating to the client application that the user has an interest in a hyperlink displayed as part of the search engine result set in the first web document, the hyperlink referencing a second web document. Heilbron discloses receiving in a client application an interest signal generated in response to a user action, the interest signal indicating to the client application that the user has an interest in a hyperlink displayed as part of the search engine result set in the first web document, the hyperlink referencing a second web document [col 5, lines 60-65, cursor 214 is moved over a web page link for about 1-2 seconds]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sommerer to include above limitation as taught by Heilbron for the purpose of providing a user with a plurality of web sites which have information of interest to the user. The user can subsequently download one or more of the web sites which are displayed on the at least one search results page.

The combination of Sommerer and Heilbron further discloses automatically generating in the client application a request signal in response to the interest signal and sending the request signal to a second server to request a text extract, the text extract comprising text data previously extracted from the second web document and stored separately from the second web document

[Heilbron, Fig 5, col 8, lines 45-60, local cache, proxy cache, centralized server or web server contains the information]

The combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses receiving the text extract in response to the request signal and displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document, in response to the interest signal [Heilbron, col 6, lines 35-40, this separate content generation provides useful information to the user on a large fraction of links even if the web page author(s) did not provide content for information regions]

Regarding claim 2, 30, 56, 58, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses logging the interest signal [Heilbron, col 7, lines 10-15] .

Regarding claim 3, 31, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses receiving user-related information in response to the request signal and displaying the user-related information to the user [Heilbron, abstract]

Regarding claim 4, 14, 32, 42, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein the user-related information comprises query-related information [Sommerer, paragraph 6] .

Regarding claim 7, 35, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses receiving past-user information in response to the request signal and displaying the past-user information to the user [Heilbron, col 7, lines 10-15]

Regarding claim 8, 36, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein the past-user information comprises a user-supplied rating of the second web document [Heilbron, col 7, lines 35-40, adult content]

Regarding claim 9, 37, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein the past-user information comprises at least one of: a period of linger time, a quantity of repeat visits, a

quantity of repeat queries, and a quantity of click-throughs [Heilbron, col 7, lines 10-20, col 5, lines 60-65]

Regarding claim 10, 38, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron disclose receiving a genre of the second web document in response to the request signal and displaying the genre to the user [Heilbron, col 6, lines 50-65]

Regarding claim 11, 39, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses receiving a relationship of the first and second web documents in response to the request signal and displaying the relationship to the user [Heilbron, col 6, lines 50-65]

Regarding claim 15, 43, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses receiving a comparison between content from the first web document and content from the second web document in response to the request signal and displaying the comparison to the user [Heilbron, col 6, line 45, content of web page left unchanged]

Regarding claim 16, 44, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses receiving a cached representation of a previously-available second web document in response to the request signal and displaying the cached representation to the user [Heilbron, col 8, lines 50-55]

Regarding claim 19, 45, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document comprises displaying text extract in an overlay over the first web document [Heilbron, col 6, lines 40-50]

Regarding claim 25, 51, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document comprises displaying the text extract with the first web document [Heilbron, col 6, lines 45-50]

Regarding claim 28, 54, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document comprises displaying a hyperlink referencing a third web document, the third web document comprising the text extract [Sommerer, paragraph 6]

Regarding claim 70, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses wherein the first and second servers collectively comprise a single server [Sommerer, paragraph 3].

Claims 18, 22-24 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brown (Pub No US 2003/0172126), hereafter Brown.

Regarding claim 18, 22, 48, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses the elements of the invention as noted above but does not disclose right-clicking a pointing device on the hyperlink. Brown discloses right-clicking the pointing device on the hyperlink [Fig 3, paragraph 27]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include above limitation as taught by Brown for the purpose of selecting condensed page information [paragraph 27].

Regarding claim 23, 24, 49, 50, the combination of Sommerer, Heilbron and Brown discloses wherein displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document comprises displaying text extract in a pop-up window [Brown Fig 4, paragraph 30]

Claims 20 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Knight et al (Pub No US 2004/0004632), hereafter Knight.

Regarding claim 20, 46, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose wherein the overlay comprises a tooltip. Knight discloses wherein the overlay comprises a tooltip [abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include above limitation as taught by Knight for the purpose of selection an object to be displayed on the screen [abstract]

Claims 21 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Clark et al (US Pat No 6,300,950), hereafter Clark.

Regarding claim 21, 47, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron disclose the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but do not disclose displaying the text extract the user in association with the first web document comprises displaying the text extract information in a status bar. Clark discloses displaying the text extract the user in association with the first web document comprises displaying the text extract information in a status bar [col 1, lines 35-40]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include above limitation as taught by Clark for the purpose of displaying information when a user input device controlled pointer passes over some part of the interface [col 1, lines 10-15]

Claims 26 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Zondervan et al (Pub No US 2002/0059073), hereafter Zondervan.

Regarding claim 26, 52, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document comprises audibly outputting the text extract. Zondervan discloses displaying the text extract to the user in association with the first web document comprises audibly outputting the text extract [paragraph 13]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include above limitation as taught by Zondervan for the purpose of providing the output to the user in a hands-free mode.

Claims 27 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bruneau et al (US Pat No 6,707,443), hereafter Bruneau.

Regarding claim 27, 53, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose a haptic device. Bruneau discloses a haptic device [Fig 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include a haptic device as taught by Bruneau for the purpose of indicating the importance of a document.

Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schneider (US Pat No 6,895,430), hereafter Schneider.

Regarding claim 68, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose further comprising generating the text extract at the search engine based on crawling a web site storing the second web document. Schneider discloses further comprising generating the text extract at the search engine based on crawling a web site storing the second web document [col 19, lines 45-60, Fig 6b]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include above limitation as taught by Schneider for the purpose of maintaining a domain name status database [col 19, lines 60-65].

Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rogalski et al (US Pat No 6,976,059), hereafter Rogalski.

Regarding claim 69, the combination of Sommerer and Heilbron discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not disclose a browser-enabled JavaScript application. Rogalski discloses a JavaScript which is processed by a browser [Fig 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include above limitation as taught by Rogalski for the purpose of rendering a graphic [Fig 5].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/15/2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

7/7/2008

/Etienne P LeRoux/

Art Unit: 2161

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161